

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 4-5, and 7-20 are pending in the application. Claim 9 is amended herein to correct an inadvertent typographical error. This amendment is not made to overcome any prior-art rejections. The Applicant hereby requests further examination and reconsideration of the application in view of the foregoing amendments and these remarks.

### Missing IDS:

An information disclosure statement was filed with the USPTO on 04/26/2001. In the next office action, we request official acknowledgment of the references cited therein by the Examiner. For your convenience, we are enclosing copies of the information disclosure statement filed on 04/26/2001 and the return postcard, which was stamped as received by the OIPE on 04/27/2001.


### Claims:

Claims 1, 4, 5, 7, and 8 are allowed. In paragraph 3, the Examiner rejected claims 9, 11-14, and 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Wang ('250). In paragraph 4, the Examiner objected to claims 10 and 15-17 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but indicated that those claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. For the following reasons, the Applicant submits that all pending claims are allowable over Wang ('250).

The Wang ('250) reference is a U.S. patent having a common inventor with the present application. Submitted herewith is a Declaration under 37 CFR 1.132, which establishes that Zhenyu Wang (the common inventor) conceived and invented the subject matter disclosed in the Wang ('250) reference that pertains to processing of signals in a network employing robbed bit signaling and is relied on by the Examiner in the rejection of claims 9, 11-14, and 18-20 of the present application. The Applicant therefore submits that said subject matter of the Wang ('250) reference was derived from Zhenyu Wang and, as such, is not the invention by "another." It is thus submitted that the Wang ('250) reference is not a proper prior-art reference, and that the rejections of claims over Wang ('250) should be withdrawn. As such, the rejections of claims 9, 11-14, and 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) have been overcome.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, the Applicant believes that the now-pending claims are in condition for allowance. Therefore, the Applicant believes that the entire application is now in condition for allowance, and early and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Yuri Gruzdkov  
Registration No. 50,762  
Agent for Applicant  
(215) 557-8544 (phone)  
(215) 557-8477 (fax)

Date: 10/10/05

Customer No. 46900  
Mendelsohn & Associates, P.C.  
1500 John F. Kennedy Blvd., Suite 405  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19102

CHOU 2 - 9 - 5

The stamp of the Patent Office Mail Room hereon will be taken as acknowledging receipt of:

- X Specification: 12 numbered pages (including Abstract p.12);  
4 Sheets of drawing  
X 1 Assignment and 2 copies of Cover Sheet  
X Declaration and Power of Attorney  
Information Disclosure Statement  
X Certificate of Express Mailing No. ET 210285564 US  
X Postcard



j1017 U.S. PTO  
09/846566



04/27/01



**IN THE UNITED STATES  
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

# 2  
RS  
PTO 6  
6-26-01

j1017 U.S. PTO  
09/846566  
  
04/27/01

**Attorney Docket No.**

CHOU 2 - 9 - 5

**TITLE**

## **COMPENSATING FOR RANDOM ROBBED BIT SIGNALING**

**Application No.:**

**Filing Date:**

### **Group Art Unit:**

**THE COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231**

# **INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT**

Herewith the Information Disclosure Statement Pursuant to 37 CFR 1.98. Copies of the cited documents are enclosed.

Respectfully,

Howard R. Popper  
Reg. No. 19,208  
Attorney for Appellee

**Attorney for Applicant**

Dated: April 26, 2001